

25th January 1928]

Public Service

Exemptions to unpassed clerks.

* 1459 Q.—Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state with reference to the answers to clauses (a) and (b) of question No. 785 dated 31st March 1927—

(a) why retrospective effect was not given to exemptions granted to unpassed clerks who were in service prior to 1st March 1921, and why the matter was left to be determined on consideration of individual cases;

(b) what is the number of unpassed clerks in permanent service prior to 1st March 1921, and what is the length of the service of each of them up to 1921; and

(c) whether there are any specific grounds for differentiating the claims of such men from those of the unqualified Secondary School-Leaving Certificate men and if so, what they are?

A.—(a) Because the Government were aware of no reason for any general order.

(b) These particulars have not been compiled and the Government do not propose to call for them.

(c) By the term 'unqualified Secondary School-Leaving Certificate men', the hon. Member presumably refers to men whose Secondary School-Leaving Certificates show that they had not obtained at the public examination the minimum number of marks prescribed in G.O. No. 965, Public, dated 16th November 1926, and who were confirmed before 16th November 1926. They had the requisite qualifications at the time they entered service and were confirmed. The 'unpassed' men never had such qualifications.

Survey and Settlement

Hearing of objections to rough pattas of Narikombu village.

* 1460 Q.—Mr. K. R. KARANT: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the number of applications posted for hearing on 17th December 1927 at Panemangalore (South Kanara district) for hearing objections to rough pattas of Narikombu village (old Kasaragod taluk) by the Special Deputy Tahsildar of Settlement;

(b) whether it is a fact that sufficient time was not given between the date of service of the pattas to the concerned ryots and the date of hearing;

(c) whether it is a fact that the patta was received by one Mr. Sudekar Timmappaya only on 17th December 1927 when the hearing was for the same date;

(d) whether in almost all cases rough pattas were not served on the ryots concerned;

(e) what is the date on which rough pattas should have been served on the ryots of the villages and the date or dates on which they were actually served;

(f) whether there is any record to show when the pattas were actually served personally or in their absence through a member of the house or otherwise;

[25th January 1928]

(g) whether it is a fact that some of the ryots have filed objections stating that they cannot state their full objections without obtaining certified copies of the resurvey plans;

(h) whether it is a fact that no adjournment was given;

(i) whether it is a fact that this practice is being followed not merely with reference to the village aforesaid, but with reference to all villages in which settlement operations are now going on;

(j) what steps the Government propose to take to redress the grievances of the ryots in the matter; and

(k) what objections have the Government to see that rough pattas are properly served on the ryots and that sufficient time is granted to them to obtain copies of plans and then file objections?

A.—The Government have not any information about the particular case referred to, but, as it is their policy and desire that proper notice should be given of rough pattas and full opportunity afforded to those interested to file objections and that such objections should be properly heard and determined, the question has been referred to the Board of Revenue for enquiry and report.

Alleged irregularities in issuing pattas in South Kanara.

* 1461 Q.—Mr. J. A. SALDANHA: With reference to the answer to Mr. Schamnad's question No. 700 answered on 19th October 1927 regarding alleged irregularities in issuing pattas in South Kanara, will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Settlement Officer has received complaints from patta-dars on the subject, what the nature of the various complaints is, what action has been taken thereon; and

(b) what action has been taken on the suggestion that in the case of absentee landlords Government should send them pattas by registered post at the cost of such landlords?

A.—(a) The Government have not the information. The hon. Member is referred to the answer to question 1460.

(b) The suggestion was examined but was not adopted as no practicable method could be devised of recovering the cost of sending rough pattas by registered post from the addressees.

Forests

Timber depot in the Ghumsur division (Ganjam district).

* 1462 Q.—Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) the number of depots the Government had in the Ghumsur division (Ganjam district) for sale of timber in each of the years from 1917-18 to 1920-21;

(b) the number of depots now kept in the division;

(c) the price of good timber (logs) per cubic foot sold in these depots in each of these years;

(d) the price at which good timber as stated in (c) is sold to the Saw Mill at Russellkonda in each of the years from 1923 to 1927 per cubic foot;